REMARKS

Claims 32, 35, 39-41, 47, 50 and 51 are presented for consideration, with Claims 32 and 47 being independent.

The independent claims have been amended to better set forth Applicants' invention. In addition, Claims 50 and 51 have been added to provide an additional scope of protection.

Claims 32, 35 and 39-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Morozumi '403. In addition, Claim 47 is rejected as allegedly being anticipated by Amano '607. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 32 of Applicants' invention relates to an image display apparatus comprised of a plurality of display devices wired in a matrix through a plurality of scanning signal wirings and a plurality of modulated signal wirings, and a driving circuit configured to apply a modulated signal having a modulated pulsewidth to each of the plurality of modulated signal wirings. As claimed, the driving circuit has a plurality of transistors connected in parallel to one of the plurality of modulated signal wirings, with the plurality of transistors including a first transistor and a second transistor, and a duration of a time period in which the first transistor is in an on state and a duration of a time period in which the second transistor is in an on state are different from each other.

The Morozumi patent relates to a multi-color LCD display comprised of a matrix of picture element electrodes (display devices) 330, an X shift register 321, and a Y shift register 322.

In contrast to Applicants' Claim 32, however, Morozumi is not understood to teach or suggest, among other features, a plurality of transistors connected in parallel to one of the modulated signal wirings. In this regard, the Office Action asserts that transistors 323 are connected in parallel to one of the modulated signal wirings. As understood, however, these transistors, which are shown, for example, in Figure 28, are connected in series to the shift register 321, switching matrix 324 and the display devices 330. With this arrangement, each transistor can be switched to allow current flow or no current flow into one X column.

It is submitted, therefore, Morozumi fails to anticipate or render obvious Applicants' invention as set forth in Claim 32. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 32, 35 and 39-41 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

Claim 47 of Applicants' invention relates to an image display apparatus comprised of a plurality of display devices wired in a matrix through scanning signal wirings and modulated signal wirings, and a drive circuit configured to apply a pulse signal as a modulated signal having a modulated pulsewidth to each of the plurality of modulated signal wirings. As claimed, at least one pulse signal has a first portion at the leading edge of the pulse signal and a second portion at the trailing edge of the pulse signal. In the first portion, a signal level of the pulse rises up to a first predetermined level which is lower than a maximum level of the pulse signal and is maintained at the first predetermined level during a first predetermined time period. In the second portion, a signal level of the pulse falls down to a second predetermined level

which is lower than the maximum level of the pulse signal and is maintained at the second predetermined level during the second predetermined time period.

The patent to Amano relates to a video display system having a flat panel with an X and Y matrix. Row lines X and column lines Y are driven to adjust the brightness of the video display by changing the combination of a width and an amplitude of a driving pulse.

In contrast to Claim 47, however, Amano is not understood to teach or suggest, among other features, a first portion of a leading edge of the pulse signal having a signal level of the pulse rising up to a first predetermined level which is lower than a maximum level of the pulse signal and is maintained at the first predetermined level during a first predetermined time period. The Office Action asserts that the pulsewidth shown in Figure 9 of Amano provides for this feature. It is respectfully submitted, however, that Figure 9 merely shows 16 different driving current pulses representing different levels (0 to 15) of an input video signal. The different driving current pulses cannot be compared to one another to meet the features of Applicants' Claim 47. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 47 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, it is submitted that Applicants' invention as set forth in independent Claims 32 and 47 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, dependent Claims 35, 39, 41, 50 and 51 set forth additional features of Applicants' invention. Independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of this application is deemed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Malpede/

Scott D. Malpede
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 32,533

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

SDM\rnm

DC_MAIN 268003v1